

Ambiguities in second-order cosmological perturbations for non-canonical scalar fields

Corrado Appignani⁽¹⁾, Roberto Casadio⁽¹⁾, S. Shankaranarayanan^{(2,3)*}

⁽¹⁾ *Dipartimento di Fisica, Universit'a di Bologna and I.N.F.N., Sezione di Bologna, via Irnerio 46, 40126 Bologna, Italy*

⁽²⁾ *Institute of Cosmology and Gravitation, University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, UK*

⁽³⁾ *School of Physics, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research-Trivandrum, CET campus, Thiruvananthapuram 695 016, India*

Over the last few years, it was realised that non-canonical scalar fields can lead to the accelerated expansion in the early universe. The primordial spectrum in these scenarios not only shows near scale-invariance consistent with CMB observations, but also large primordial non-Gaussianity. Second-order perturbation theory is the primary theoretical tool to investigate such non-Gaussianity. However, it is still uncertain which quantities are gauge-invariant at second-order and their physical understanding therefore remains unclear. As an attempt to understand second order quantities, we consider a general non-canonical scalar field, minimally coupled to gravity, on the unperturbed FRW background where metric fluctuations are neglected a priori. In this simplified set-up, we show that there arise ambiguities in the expressions of physically relevant quantities, such as the effective speeds of the perturbations. Further, the stress tensor and energy density display a potential instability which is not present at linear order.

Keywords: Inflation, non-canonical scalar field, higher order cosmological perturbation

1. Introduction and motivation

Predictions of inflation seem to be in excellent agreement with the CMB data.¹ However, it is still unclear what is the nature of the field which drives inflation. Historically, a canonical scalar field has been the preferred candidate for inflaton, but in recent years, also a non-canonical scalar field, dubbed as k -inflaton, was considered as serious alternative mechanisms to drive inflation.²

Both scenarios lead to nearly scale invariant power-spectra with negligible running and hence can not be distinguished (or ruled out) from the current CMB data.¹ The future missions, including PLANCK,³ hold promise in ruling out either of these two scenarios by looking at the non-Gaussianity of the primordial spectra, but quantifying non-Gaussianity requires one to go beyond linear order.⁴⁻⁶

There are four different approaches in the literature to study cosmological perturbations: 1) solving Einstein's equations order-by-order;⁷ 2) the covariant approach based on a general frame vector u^α ;⁸ 3) the Arnowitt-Deser-Misner (ADM) approach based on the normal frame vector n^α ;⁹ 4) the reduced action approach.¹⁰ In the case of linear perturbations, it was shown that all of these four approaches lead to identical equations of motion. However, to our knowledge, a complete analysis has not been done in the literature for higher-order perturbations.

In this talk, to illustrate the problems that may occur at higher-order, and not to get bogged-down with the gauge issues, we consider a simple situation: we freeze

*speaker; E-mail: shanki@iisertvm.ac.in

all metric perturbations and focus on the perturbations of a minimally-coupled, generalised scalar field ϕ , whose Lagrangian density is given by²

$$\mathcal{L} = P(X, \phi), \quad \text{where} \quad 2X = \nabla^\alpha \phi \nabla_\alpha \phi. \quad (1)$$

More precisely, we will only consider linear perturbations of the scalar field,

$$\phi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \phi_0(t) + \delta^{(1)}\phi(t, \mathbf{x}), \quad (2)$$

about the 4-dimensional FRW background, while expanding all the dependent quantities, like X and stress tensor, up to second order, and highlight the main differences in these approaches. For this purpose, it is convenient to compare the ratio

$$c_s^2 = \frac{\text{coefficients of } (\delta\phi_{,i}/a)^2}{\text{coefficients of } \delta\phi^2}, \quad (3)$$

in the components of the stress tensor and related quantities. Since c_s^2 is dimensionally the square of a speed, we will refer to this ratio as the “speed of propagation”.

2. Key results

Below, we will provide the key results and, for details, we refer the reader to Ref.¹¹

Perturbed tensor and ADM approach: For an arbitrary scalar field Lagrangian, $\delta^{(2)}T_{00}$ may represent an unstable perturbation; only under very special conditions, most notably for the canonical scalar field, the *effective speed of propagation* of $\delta^{(2)}T_{00}$ (and $\delta^{(2)}T_{ii}$) are the same as that of the standard definition¹²

$$c_{\delta\phi}^2 = \frac{P_x^{(0)}}{P_x^{(0)} + P_{xx}^{(0)} \dot{\phi}_0^2} \quad (4)$$

Using (3), we can define speeds related with the propagation of density perturbations in the background frame from $\delta^{(2)}T_{00}$ and $\delta^{(2)}T_{ii}$, respectively,

$$c_0^2 = \frac{P_x^{(0)} - P_{xx}^{(0)} \dot{\phi}_0^2}{P_x^{(0)} + 4P_{xx}^{(0)} \dot{\phi}_0^2 + P_{xxx}^{(0)} \dot{\phi}_0^4}, \quad c_{\parallel}^2 = c_{\delta\phi}^2. \quad (5)$$

Note that these velocities become imaginary indicating that the perturbations may be unstable. The nature of this instability is easily understood in analogy with classical mechanics: when $c_{\delta\phi}^2$ is negative, the system resembles an inverted harmonic oscillator and, no matter how small $\delta\phi$, it will rapidly run away from the background solution ϕ_0 and from the perturbative regime.

Covariant approach: In the fluid frame, the energy density exhibits the same kind of instability as the perturbed stress-tensor $\delta^{(2)}T_{00}$, also for the canonical scalar field. In particular, the perturbations turn out to be unstable because of the negative sign of the spatial momentum contribution. Only under special conditions, the *effective speed of propagation* of the energy density and pressure perturbations are equal. Using (3), the speed of propagation for density and pressure perturbations in the fluid frame are

$$c_\rho^2 = -\frac{P_x^{(0)} + P_{xx}^{(0)} \dot{\phi}_0^2}{P_x^{(0)} + 4P_{xx}^{(0)} \dot{\phi}_0^2 + P_{xxx}^{(0)} \dot{\phi}_0^4}, \quad c_p^2 = c_{\parallel}^2 = c_{\delta\phi}^2, \quad (6)$$

which differ from Eq. (5).

Symmetry reduced approach: The basic idea here is to perturb the action about the FRW background, up to second (or higher) order, and reduce it so that the perturbations are described in terms of a single gauge-invariant variable. The second order canonical Hamiltonian is identical to the stress-tensor for the canonical scalar field, but differs for general non-canonical fields. This implies that $\delta^{(2)}T_{00}$ and the canonical Hamiltonian $\delta^{(2)}\mathcal{H}$ may become unstable under different conditions.

3. Discussion

The first question is why the canonical Hamiltonian, perturbed stress tensor and super-Hamiltonian coincide for a canonical scalar field, but not for general scalar field Lagrangians. To go about answering this question, it is necessary to look at the four approaches we have employed from a different perspective. In the first two approaches – perturbed stress tensor and covariant approach – we perturb the general expression for the scalar field stress tensor and obtain its second order contribution $\delta^{(2)}T_{00}$. In the last two approaches – ADM formulation and symmetry-reduced action – we expand the action to second order in the perturbation and obtain the super-(canonical) Hamiltonian of the corresponding perturbed action. While the super-Hamiltonian $\delta^{(2)}H$ is identical to $\delta^{(2)}T_{00}$, the canonical Hamiltonian $\delta^{(2)}\mathcal{H}$ differs.

Under what condition the super-Hamiltonian $\delta^{(2)}H$, the canonical Hamiltonian $\delta^{(2)}\mathcal{H}$ for non-canonical scalar fields are identical? They are all identical provided the time-variation of background quantities (like $P_x^{(0)}$ and $P_{xx}^{(0)}$) can be neglected. (For the canonical scalar field, these functions are indeed constant and the perturbed quantities therefore coincide.) Although such an approximation may be valid for specific non-canonical fields, they fail for some of the known fields like Tachyon, DBI.¹¹

R. C. is supported by the INFN grant BO11 and S. S. was supported by the Marie Curie Incoming International Grant IIF-2006-039205.

References

1. E. Komatsu et al, *Astrophys. J. Sup.* **180**, 330 (2009).
2. C. Armendariz-Picon, T. Damour and V. F. Mukhanov, *Phys. Lett.* **B458**, 209 (1999).
3. Planck, *The Scientific Programme of Planck* (ESA Publications, 2005).
4. M. Bruni et al, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **14**, 2585 (1997).
5. J. M. Maldacena, *JHEP* **05**, p. 013 (2003).
6. D. Seery and J. E. Lidsey, *JCAP* **0506**, p. 003 (2005).
7. E. M. Lifshitz and I. M. Khalatnikov, *Adv. Phys.* **12**, 185 (1963).
8. S. W. Hawking, *Astrophys. J.* **145**, 544 (1966).
9. J. M. Bardeen, *Phys. Rev.* **D22**, 1882 (1980).
10. V. N. Lukash, *ZhETF* **31**, 631 (1980).
11. C. Appignani, R. Casadio and S. Shankaranarayanan, arxiv: 0905.4184 (2009).
12. J. Garriga and V. F. Mukhanov, *Phys. Lett.* **B458**, 219 (1999).